

RICHARD D. McGOEY, P.E. (MY & PA)
WILLIAM J. HAUSER, P.E. (MY & MJ)
MARK J. EDSALL, P.E. (MY & PA)
JAMES M. FARR, P.E. (MY & PA)

MAIN OFFICE
33 AIRPORT CENTER DRIVE
SUITE 202
NEW WINDSOR, NEW YORK 12553

(845) \$67-3100 FAX: (845) 567-3232 E-MAIL: MHENY@MHEPC.COM

WRITER'S E-MAIL ADDRESS: MJE@MHEPC.COM

TOWN OF NEW WINDSOR PLANNING BOARD REVIEW COMMENTS

PROJECT NAME: PATRIOT BLUFF CONDO SITE PLAN

(LANDS OF RPA ASSOC.)

PROJECT LOCATION: NYS ROUTE 32 AND UNION AVE (CR 69)

SECTION 4 - BLOCK 2 - LOT 21.2

PROJECT NUMBER:

01-65

DATE:

8 AUGUST 2007

DESCRIPTION:

THE APPLICATION INVOLVES THE DEVELOPMENT OF A 175-UNIT MULTI-FAMILY CONDOMINIUM SITE PLAN ON THE WESTERLY PORTION OF THE RPA PROPERTY. THE PLAN WAS PREVIOUSLY REVEIWED AT THE 12 DECEMBER 2001, 22 MAY 2002, 10 MARCH 2004, 9 MAY 2007 AND 27 JUNE 2007 PLANNING BOARD MEETINGS.

1. This site plan development is a component of the Planned Unit Development (PUD) previously reviewed and approved by the Town Board.

The applicant currently has a site plan application and a subdivision application (01-66) before the Planning Board. The applicant recently made a presentation before the Board with regard to a modification of the applications to develop the westerly portion of the project as multi-family in lieu of single-family residential. The Board, in general, endorsed the proposed (modified) plan at the most recent meeting. Also at that meeting, the proposed draft scope for the SDEIS was discussed. The updated scope has been distributed to each Board member.

The purpose of the appearance at this meeting is as follows:

 Applicant seeks verification that the scope for the DSEIS previously adopted by the Board, and modified based on the revised proposal, is acceptable (such that they can proceed with preparation of the document based on the revised development plan).

(see my comments regarding the scope, below)

- 2. For the Board's reference, I have reviewed the proposed scope and note the following comments:
 - Section 1.0, Introduction, Page 1, end of paragraph #1, revise wording of "which are beyond the scope of the project".
 - <u>Section 1.0, Introduction</u>, shouldn't this section make reference to the subdivided multifamily alternative (fee-simple lots). Or is it appropriate this only be acknowledged later in alternatives?
 - <u>Section 3.0, Project Description</u>, Second Paragraph, Page 2, this section should also note
 that intent of Park Hill Drive emergency connection is also to provide secondary
 emergency access to Park Hill development (which currently only has one means of
 access for entire development).
 - Section 3.0, Project Description, Third Paragraph, Page 2, should note that original SEQRA review for Sky Lom PUD, Town Board was lead agency. Planning Board on behalf of Town of New Windsor, has "re-opened" SEQRA to review potential impacts of the site plan and subdivision applications, under current (updated) conditions and now based on the new site plan proposed.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mark J. Edsall, P.E., P.P. Planning Board Engineer

NW01-65-08Aug07.doc MJE/st